



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,362	2 10/14/2003		Joseph A. Zupanick	067083.0283	9284
26231	7590	09/28/2005		EXAM	INER
FISH & RI	CHARD	SON P.C.	STEPHENSON, DANIEL P		
1717 MAIN			ARTIBUT	DAREN MENADER	
SUITE 5000			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
DALLAS, 7	TX 7520	1	3672		

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/687,362	ZUPANICK, JOSEPH A.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Daniel P. Stephenso	on 3672
The MAILING DATE of this come Period for Reply	munication appears on the cover sh	heet with the correspondence address
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM TH - Extensions of time may be available under the prov after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this	IE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMI isions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however communication. um statutory period will apply and will expire SIX reply will, by statute, cause the application to be inths after the mailing date of this communication	, may a reply be timely filed (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. come ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 September 2005.	
2a) This action is FINAL .	2b) ☑ This action is non-final.	
<u>'</u>	, —	al matters, prosecution as to the merits is
•	ractice under Ex parte Quayle, 193	•
		• 11
Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are pending in t	he application.	
4a) Of the above claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration	on.
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>18-20 and 23</u> is/are allo	owed.	
6) Claim(s) <u>1-4,8-10,14-17,21 and</u>	22 is/are rejected.	
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>5-7 and 11-13</u> is/are ob	ejected to.	
8) Claim(s) are subject to re	striction and/or election requireme	ent.
Application Papers		·
	w the Everiner	
9) The specification is objected to b	•	DE altrafation de la Francia
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>14 Octob</u>		·—, ·
	objection to the drawing(s) be held in	•
	-	rawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected	ed to by the Examiner. Note the at	tached Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a cl	aim for foreign priority under 35 U.	S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None o	of:	
1. Certified copies of the price	ority documents have been receive	ed.
2. Certified copies of the price	ority documents have been receive	ed in Application No
3. Copies of the certified cor	pies of the priority documents have	been received in this National Stage
•	national Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)	_
* See the attached detailed Office a		
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		erview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Revie		per No(s)/Mail Date
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-144 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/9/05, 9/13/05.	10 01 (1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	tice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) ner:
.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)	Office Action Summary	Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20050921

Application/Control Number: 10/687,362 Page 2

Art Unit: 3672

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-4, 9, 10, 15, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Russ. Russ discloses a method for removing particulate laden fluid in which a downhole device is positioned. The device contains a pump (22) and an agitator (28). The agitator agitates the fluid as it is being pumped out of the downhole cavity. The downhole device is put through a wellbore into a subsurface cavity, where the transverse dimension of the cavity is greater then the wellbore. The agitator is made of a plurality of arms that are outwardly extendable. The pump and inlet are indirectly coupled with the agitator.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-3, 9 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hillger in view of Russ. Hillger discloses a method for removing particulate laden fluid from a water well in which a downhole device is positioned. The device contains a downhole pump (7) and an agitator (29). The agitator agitates the fluid as it is being pumped out of the downhole

Application/Control Number: 10/687,362

Art Unit: 3672

cavity. Hillger does not disclose that the subsurface cavity has a transverse dimension greater then the transverse dimension of the wellbore. Russ discloses a water well where the water-bearing portion of the well has a transverse dimension greater then the wellbore leading to the cavity. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method and apparatus of Hillger with the wellbore and cavity of Russ. This would be done because Russ is disclosed as a water well and Hillger is disclosed as useful within a water well.

With regards to claim 16, it is Officially Noticed that it is notoriously conventional to use a variety of pumps in the wellbore art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a suction rod pump on the apparatus of Hillger in view of Russ. This would be done to allow for greater suction of fluid and for less contamination by particles.

It is noted that this is a reiteration of the Official Notice made in a previous action, and as such is now considered to be prior art.

5. Claims 1-4, 8-10 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fields in view of Russ. Fields discloses a method for removing particulate laden fluid from a water well in which a downhole device is positioned. The device contains a pump for the removal of fluid through an inlet (179) and an agitator (188). The agitator agitates the fluid as it is being pumped out of the downhole cavity. The agitator is comprised of a number of blunt arms that are expanded downhole inside the cavity. The arms are rotated about the longitudinal axis of the device. Fields does not disclose that the subsurface cavity has a transverse dimension greater then the transverse dimension of the wellbore. Russ discloses a water well where the

Art Unit: 3672

water-bearing portion of the well has a transverse dimension greater then the wellbore leading to the cavity. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the method and apparatus of Fields with the wellbore and cavity of Russ. This would be done because Fields would be useful in the cleaning of the debris from the bottom of the well disclosed in Russ.

With regards to claims 16 and 17, it is Officially Noticed that it is notoriously conventional to use a variety of pumps in the wellbore art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a downhole pump or suction rod pump on the apparatus of Fields in view of Russ. This would be done provide a variety of pumping methods based on design of the wellbore.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 6. Claims 18-20 and 23 are allowed.
- 7. Claims 5-7 and 11-13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel P. Stephenson whose telephone number is (571) 272-7035. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David J. Bagnell can be reached on (571) 272-6999. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/687,362 Page 5

Art Unit: 3672

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Bagnell

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Art Unit 3672

DPS W